

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-111 are pending. The claims have not been amended.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 13-15, 17, 37, 40, 41, 43, 44, 52-54, 56, 76, 77, 79, 80, 88,-90, and 92 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102 for allegedly being anticipated by Jain et al., U.S. Pat. No. 6,567,980.

Claims 3, 6, 7, 9-12, 18-36, 38, 39, 42, 45, 46, 48-51, 57-75, 78, 81, 82, 84-87, and 93-111 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103 for allegedly being obvious in view of Jain et al., taking official notice of additional facts to support the rejection without providing documentary evidence.

The undersigned would like to thank the examiner for granting an interview on May 17, 2006 to discuss the Jain reference. Unfortunately, an agreement was not reached as to distinctions between the pending claims and the Jain reference.

Independent claims 1, 18, 28, 37-40, 57, 67, 76, 93, and 103 recite similar features. Claim 1 will be discussed.

Claim 1 substantively recites in part:

- *displaying in a first area of a GUI a representation of multimedia information having first and second types of information*
- *displaying a first lens covering a portion of the first area*
- *displaying in a second area of the GUI portions of the first and second types of information of the multimedia information in the first area that are covered by the first lens*

The information displayed in the second area depends on the portion in the first area that is covered by the first lens. Moreover, the second area presents portions of the first and second types of information covered by the first lens.

The examiner made the following associations between the recited features and Jain:

*first area* ↔ keyframe panel 176

*first lens* ↔ keyframe 202

*second area* ↔ live video panel 172

Jain explains that panel 172 “displays the live video being digitized.” *Col. 4, lines 26, 27.* Jain further explains that “keyframes extracted during the capture process are displayed in a panel 176” and moreover that “the corresponding close captioned text and timecodes are displayed in a panel 178.” *Id at lines 29-31.*

First, Jain’s keyframe panel 176 does not correspond to the recited *displaying in a first area of a GUI a representation of multimedia information having first and second types of information.* Panel 176 consists of keyframes (i.e., still images) only. Jain teaches that text is displayed in panel 178. Jain’s panel 176 therefore does not display *multimedia information having first and second types of information.* Panel 176 has only one type of information, still images.

Second, Jain’s keyframe 202 does not constitute the recited *first lens.* Since panel 176 does not display *multimedia information having first and second types of information,* the keyframe 202 can not be construed to *cover a portion of the first area.* Instead, the panel 176 is defined by the collection of keyframes. Jain’s keyframe 202 does not teach or suggest the recited *displaying a first lens covering a portion of the first area.*

Third, the live video in Jain’s panel 172 “displays the live video being digitized.” The live video in panel 172 does not originate from the selection of a keyframe 202 from panel 176. In fact, Jain clearly discloses that “keyframes extracted during the capture process are displayed in a panel 176.” However, the recited second area displays *portions of the first and second types of information of the multimedia information in the first area that are covered by the first lens.* Panel 172 does not display live video based on a selected keyframe, but rather displays live video that is being digitized from an external source. Jain’s panel 172 does not teach or suggest the recited *displaying in a second area of the GUI portions of the first and second types of information of the multimedia information in the first area that are covered by the first lens.*

For any one of the foregoing reasons, the Section 102 rejection of the claims is believed to be overcome. As for the claims rejected under Section 103, Jain was relied on for the foregoing features recited in the Section 103 claims. The Section 103 rejection of the claims is therefore overcome for the reasons set forth above.

Appl. No. 10/081,129  
Amdt. sent May 18, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of January 5, 2006

PATENT

The undersigned respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the foregoing remarks.

**CONCLUSION**

All claims pending in this Application are believed to be in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,



George B. F. Yee  
Reg. No. 37,478

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 650-326-2400  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
GBFY:cmm  
60769461 v1